<u>Remarks/Arguments</u>

Reconsideration of this Application is requested.

Applicant is filing this amendment under CFR §1.111 to reopen prosecution of this application.

Claims 1 and 6 -22 have been rejected by the Examiner, under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed subject matter is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Amended independent claim 1 does not merely recite an incidental physical limitation, but rather is tied to operation of a system including a physical computer, physical mail and databases for delivering physical mail to a receipient.

Applicant respectfully submit that independent claim 1 as amended, and those claims dependent thereon recite sufficient ties to another statutory class and/or sufficient transformation. Thus, claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon claim statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 6 -21 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Boies et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,200) in view of Moore (U.S. Patent 5,452,203), Whitehouse (U.S. patent 6,005,945) and Allum (U.S. Patent No. 5,420,403).

Boies discloses the following in lines 30-64 of column 2:

> "The process is illustrated in more detail in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C, to which reference is now made. A transaction begins at block **201** with the user wanting a product that cannot be sent electronically, i.e., over the Internet. An initial determination is made in decision block **202** as to whether the user has an address code. If not, the mailing address information is collected from the user in function block **203**. Next, in function block **204**, the registry is contacted to obtain an address code. This routine is shown in more detail in FIG. 2B and begins with validating the address in function block **205**. An address code is assigned in function block **206**, and this code is saved in function block **207** to the shipping company's master file database **208** before a return is made in function block **209** to the main routine in FIG. 2A where the code is displayed and saved to the user's computer in function block **210**.

Referring again to FIG. 2A, once the user has an address code then a determination is made in decision block **211** as to whether the address code is available. If not, the user is prompted to enter the address code in function block **212**; otherwise, the code is directly retrieved from the user's hard disk in function block **213**. The address code is added to the order form in function block **214**, and the order is submitted in function block **215**.

Referring now to FIG. 2C, when the vendor receives the order, the vendor optionally creates a printed, machine readable representation of the address code on the shipping label in function block **216**. The address code is printed to on [sic] the shipping label in function block **217**, and the package is sent to the shipping company in function block **218**. The shipping company uses the machine readable address code printed on the shipping label to access the master file **208** (FIG. 2B) to retrieve the user 'shipping [sic] address for delivery of the package."

Boies discloses the following in column 2, lines 11-22:

"The method used in this invention is to employ a third party vendor to supply a unique identifier to the customer that maps to the customer's name and address in a database owned by the third party. The personal identifier is a multi-digit numeric or alphanumeric code assigned to a customer, as indicated at **10**. This code is an accepted field by the vendor **12** that is used for shipping purposes. The shipper **14** is the creator and custodian of the codes. It generates a unique code for each customer, which code is associated with the customer's full shipping address and, optionally, the customer's name, permitting shipment to be made to the customer **16**."

In other words, Boies' customer receives a customer number that is assigned by the shipper of the goods **14**. Boies' customer would give the customer number to the seller of the goods to remain anonymous. The seller, in turn, would give the customer number to the shipper with the goods. Then the shipper would obtain the customer's address from the customer number.

Boies is not determining in one or more data bases that recipient's name is listed with recipient's desired delivery address and is the address to which the owner of the

virtual post office box wants the mail forwarded, wherein the forwarding information may be sent by telephone, physical mail, or facsimile. For instance, when the customer gives Boies' seller the customer number, which may contain many alphanumeric characters, the customer may communicate with the seller over the telephone and give the seller the incorrect customer number, or the seller may copy the customer number incorrectly. The seller may also give the incorrect customer number. Thus, the goods may be delivered to the wrong party.

Moore's United States Patent 5,452,203 discloses the following in col. 1, lines 46-60:

> "For example, assuming a shipper's customer shipping list includes the address "Pitney Bowes Inc., 35 Waterview Drive, Shelton, Conn. 06484", and the shipper attempts to sanitize its shipping list in order to add the zip-code. IN practice, the database of mailing addresses and customer shipping list are processed in a personal computer programmed to make a comparison between the respective addresses in the database and shipping list and generate a sanitized customer shipping list which includes the proper mailing address. When this occurs the sanitized shipping list will include the address "Pitney Bowes, Inc., Box 3000, Shelton, Conn. 06484-8000", since the mailing address for Pitney Bowes' 35 Waterview Drive facility is a Post Office Box and not the facility itself."

Thus, Moore discloses an apparatus for correcting addresses.

Allum et al. discloses the following in his abstract:

> "Mail can be sorted automatically to point of delivery level by deriving from the address including postal code on a piece of mail a suffix which together with the postal code forms routing data which uniquely identifies the final delivery address. This is achieved automatically at the Post office sorting facility by means of an optical character reader which reads the addresses on mail items and a computer arranged to generate a suffix based on the address read. The routing data is printed as a bar code on the mail item and this allows the complete sortation to be effected automatically. Also contemplated is a progressive encoding system which can be applied as bar codes by customers as desired to mail pieces. The basic data is the routing data set to which can be added a shipment number which allows automatic revenue accounting control and a piece number which allows

automatic track and trace. Finally, the customer may also progressively encode return mail envelopes with the shipment number followed by a product code and a user defined field which permits automatic specialized handling of the return mail item."

The bar code disclosed by Allum in Figs. 7 and 8 is nothing more than the Canadian equivalent of the United States Postal Service's post net bar code. The post net bar code allows postal sorting equipment to sort mail pieces to recipient's building. In many areas, office buildings and apartment houses contain many occupants. Thus, without the recipient's name, the letter carrier would not know which occupant should receive the mail piece.

Whitehouse discloses the following in lines 57-65 of column 12:

"The central computer, after decrypting the request message, validates the postal indicium request by verifying the digital signature, if any, in the request, and validating the meter or account ID and account password in the request message (step **202**, by validation procedure **161**). If the meter/account ID does not correspond to an active postage dispensing account, or if the password is incorrect, an error message is returned to the request sender."

Whitehouse is verifying a digital signature. Boies et al, Allum et al., Whitehouse, or Moore, taken separately or together, do not disclose or anticipate the invention claimed by Applicant's in claim 1 as amended and those claims dependent thereon. The cited references do not disclose or anticipate the steps of determining in one or more data bases that recipient's name is listed with recipient's desired delivery address and is the address to which the owner of the virtual post office box wants the mail forwarded, wherein the forwarding information may be sent by telephone, physical mail, or facsimile and placing recipient's desired delivery address on mail in coded form and human-readable form. The foregoing insures that the mail could be delivered to the recipient.

Claims 22 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boies, Moore, Whitehouse and Allum.

Claim 22 depends on claim 1. The art cited by the Examiner does not disclose or anticipate the following steps of claim 1 as amended. Namely, determining in one or more data bases that recipient's name is listed with recipient's desired delivery address and is the address to which the owner of the virtual post office box wants the mail forwarded, wherein the forwarding information may be sent by telephone, physical mail, or facsimile.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 6-22 as amended are patentable. If the Examiner has any questions, would the Examiner please call the undersigned at the telephone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald Reichman/
Ronald Reichman
Reg. No. 26,796
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3854

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
Shelton, CT 06484